DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 061 583 EA 004 106

AUTHOR Sikula, Andrew F.; Sikula, John P.
TITLE The Values and Value Systems of Educational Administrators.
PUB DATE Apr 72
NOTE 12p. Paper presented at American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting (57th, Chicago, Illinois, April 3-7, 1972)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *Administrative Personnel; *Administrator Attitudes; Administrator Characteristics; Administrator Role; *Beliefs; *Educational Research; Speeches; *Values

ABSTRACT

This speech reports on a study of 62 educational administrators that supplies empirical evidence in support of the contention that there are significantly different profiles associated with different occupational-career groups. Utilizing the Rokeach Value Survey Form D, the authors surveyed and compared the value configurations of 12 distinct groups and found that the profile of educational administrators differed significantly from other occupational-career and managerial groups. Educational administrators revealed that their goals or end-states of existence (terminal values) were relatively idealistic and abstract in nature while their methodology or means of achieving (instrumental values) the end-states were of much less relative concern. (Author)

ED 061583

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

THE VALUES AND VALUE SYSTEMS OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATORS

Prepared for: American Educational Research Association
Proceedings: Annual Meeting in Chicago-
April 3-7, 1972
AERA Central Office
1126 - 16th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

Prepared by: Andrew F. Sikula
Department of Management
College of Business Administration
University of Illinois at Chicago Circle
Chicago, Illinois 60680

John P. Sikula
Foundations Department
College of Education
University of Toledo
Toledo, Ohio 43606

EA 004 106

THE VALUES AND VALUE SYSTEMS OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATORS

ANDREW F. SIKULA
University of Illinois at Chicago Circle

JOHN P. SIKULA
University of Toledo

Still unanswered today are many crucial questions concerning the role expectations and job requirements of educational administrators. What idiosyncratic characteristics can be identified within such individuals? Can a stereotype or profile of a "typical" educational administrator be identified? If so, is this prototype significantly different from the constitution of an "average" businessman? What similarities and differences do educational administrators as a group have when compared to other administrators and managers, or when contrasted with various other occupations and careers? This article reports selected findings from a pioneering research study designed specifically to investigate these and related questions.

Method

Approximately three hundred Rokeach Value Surveys - Form D were initially delivered in person by the researchers to various potential respondents or their representatives. Potential respondents from seven major universities, both public and private, from within the greater metropolitan area and/or the surrounding vicinity of Chicago were asked to complete and return the Survey. Sixty-two usable Surveys were eventually returned by the educational administrators all of whom were mostly current but some former department heads and/or college deans (or their equivalents title-wise) with a minimum of two full academic years of administrative experience. This "educational administrators" group is but one of twelve groups for which the authors have gathered value data in an attempt to illustrate how various worker and managerial positions within different types of governmental, industrial, educational, and service organizations can all insightfully be analyzed

via the use of value and value system information.

Discussion

Definition of Value and Value System

Values describe what individuals consider to be important. Values represent wants, priorities, likes and/or dislikes for particular things, conditions, or situations. A person's values describe the things or ideas that matter the most to him, things which he will strive and sacrifice for in order to obtain. Values consist of opinions about what is right, fair, just, or desirable. Because values take the form of opinions, they are not subject to scientific or objective testing and validation. In addition, values represent broad guides to action. Debate exists as to whether values as guides characterize, explain, determine, and/or control individual behavior.

Value systems are a set of individual values which exist in a scale or a hierarchy that reveals their degree of relative importance. Individuals may all possess the same values but they may attach different priorities or degrees of importance to these values. Value systems are merely priority patterns of values, or a ranking of values along a continuum of importance.

Importance of Values

A new body of current research is evolving which illustrates the relationship of values and value systems to such phenomena as personal goals, interpersonal conflict, group and cultural differences, human adaptability to change, organizational climate, managerial effectiveness, organizational performance, occupation and career choice, et. al.(Sikula, 1971a, b, c, and d).

If it is assumed that values are important determinants of individual, group, and organizational behavior, questions that immediately come to mind are -- "why" and "how" do values actually affect behavior? Psychologists tell us that man lives in a universe of events and objects which do not have intrinsic meaning. Instead, man records past perceptions which contain

information about past events he has experienced. These past perceptions form categories of information which take the form of values about events. These categories, in turn, guide or filter future perceptions and interpretations of encountered objects and events. In short, man's values determine his view of the world.

Values and value systems are important for at least three reasons. First, the information an individual gains as a result of an encounter with one object should apply to other objects in that category. This means that an individual can make an inference about his relationship to an object without directly encountering that object. The inference stems from encountering another object which the individual conceives to be in the same class or category. Second, such categories provide individuals with expectations about those objects that they believe to be members of the same categories. Thus, values can direct perception and behavior by causing an individual to notice certain characteristics of an object and to react to the object on the basis of those characteristics. Third, after a person develops a system of values, this individual now opens up channels of choice along which he is able to move. Without such a system of categories (values) in which to store information, an individual cannot effectively develop a differentiated repertoire of responses; he cannot desire or want things for he has no idea what he is missing nor does he possess any sense of missing at all. Thus, a system of values constitutes a ready-made format for future thinking and behavioral responses. A system of values, accordingly, serves as a frame of reference.

Measurement of Values

The next obvious question is: "How then do we measure values?" The purpose of this report is not to review the specific techniques and devices developed to attempt to measure values. Accordingly, it can instead merely

be stated that, in general, few if any consistently reliable and valid value measuring devices have been developed. In the past, one of the most popular value measuring techniques was the Allport-Vernon-Lindzey Study of Values device. Currently, new but popular is some form of the Rokeach Value Survey. Rokeach has developed his Value Survey over the past several years to the point where many experts consider it to be the best value and value systems device currently available. Theoretical and statistical support backing the popularity of this technique is also available (Rokeach, 1968, 1971). Much and probably most of the current research being done in the area of value theory has utilized this newly developed Rokeach tool. The Rokeach Value Survey consists of two sets of values, each containing eighteen individual values. One set is called "terminal" values and represents certain end-states of existence; the other set is labeled "instrumental" values and represents "means" toward achieving the ends or terminal values. Respondents are asked to rank-order the two sets of values putting a number one in front of the most important value, a number two in front of the second most important value, et cetera, until a number eighteen is placed in front of the least (or eighteenth most) important value. Additional description and explanation of the Rokeach Value Survey are beyond the scope of this report but such information is readily available elsewhere (Rokeach, 1968, 1971).

Results

The values and value systems of the educational administrators are reported in Tables 1 and 2. Table 1 reports the medians and rankings of both the terminal and instrumental values for the sixty-two educational administrators. Table 2 presents the frequency distributions, medians, and quartile deviations of both the terminal and instrumental values for this group. Concerning the questions initially presented at the beginning of this article, a value profile or prototype for educational administrators

is indicated by the reported data in Table 1. This stereotype is considerably and significantly different in many respects from the medians and rankings reported by other occupational and career groups. The authors are currently in the process of reporting elsewhere how worker vs. managerial values and value systems differ markedly. In general, the educational administrator group is similar in many respects to other managerial groups when compared with worker groups. Managers in general, and educational administrators specifically, attach considerably more priority to competency values (such as Wisdom, Logical, and Intellectual) and to initiative values (such as Imaginative, Courageous, and A Sense of Accomplishment) than do industrial workers. These same managers and administrators relatively consider security values (such as Family Security, National Security, and A Comfortable Life) and decorum values (such as Polite, Obedient, and Clean) to be much lower in preference than do industrial workers.

In addition to these general managerial and administrative value tendencies, the researchers also found that the educational administrator group possessed some unique value characteristics when compared to and contrasted with other managerial groups and career-occupations. When the composite values and value systems of six groups of managers were analyzed, many significant differences were discovered. The six managerial groups include "industrial managers," "financial managers," "retail managers," "governmental executives," "educational administrators," and "industrial personnel managers." The reported medians for the "educational administrator" group were the lowest recorded of all the managerial groups on the values of A Sense of Accomplishment, A World at Peace, A World of Beauty, Mature Love, Social Recognition, Courageous, and Intellectual. This means that the aforementioned values are higher in priority and preference for the educational administrator group than for the other managerial groups.

The reported medians for the educational administrator group were the highest recorded of all the managerial groups on the values of Salvation, Ambitious, Clean, Honest, Obedient, and Polite. This means that the aforementioned values are lower in priority and preference for the educational administrator group than for the other managerial groups. Not surprisingly, the educational administrators revealed that their goals or end-states of existence (terminal values) were relatively very idealistic and abstract in nature - however, their methodology or means of achieving (instrumental values) the end-states were of much less relative concern. Academicians are often criticized for being over-involved with theoretical constructs and under-involved with practical applications of theoretical models. Supportingly, it seems contradictory or at least paradoxical that educational administrators relatively value A Sense of Accomplishment and Social Recognition so much and yet relatively value Ambitious and Honest so little! In fact the reported medians of the educational administrators for these four values are respectively the lowest and the highest recorded not only for the six managerial groups, but also for the remaining six occupational careers which include Negro industrial workers, Caucasian industrial workers, married female secretaries, municipal policemen, Catholic clergymen, and state legislators. It is also interesting to note that educational administrators who value Intellectual so much have almost a total disregard for the end-state of Salvation! Additionally, although this group comparatively values Social Recognition, it dramatically de-emphasizes decorum values such as Clean, Polite, and Obedient!

It should be pointed out, however, that the authors are reporting "relative" data which can often be misleading if not also interpreted in an absolute sense. The reader should refer to Tables 1 and 2 which report the absolute data for the educational administrator group - before drawing un-

warranted conclusions from the relative comparisons among the twelve groups reported by the authors. For example, although the educational administrator group had the relatively lowest preference (the numerically highest reported median) among the twelve career-occupations for the value of Honest, nevertheless, the absolute median is 4.90 and accordingly it is the second highest ranking value in the instrumental scale for this group.

With the reader hopefully keeping the above caution in mind, some additional relative career-occupational comparisons will be reported but not interpreted by the authors. Educational administrators attached more importance to the value of Intellectual than did any of the other twelve groups; they considered the value Courageous to be more important than did any of the other groups except for the state legislators; and they attached more priority to the value of Mature Love than did any other group with the exception of the married female secretaries. At the other end of the ranking continuum, it is found that of all the twelve groups previously mentioned, the educational administrators have the least consideration for the values Polite, Obedient, and Salvation.

Implications

The main intent of the authors has been to report significant similarities and differences among various career-occupations. The explanations underlying such comparisons are debatable and subject to conjecture. The key point to be noted is that the educational administrator group (or actually any of the twelve groups) has a unique value and value system profile which distinguishes it from other occupational-career groups. There is mounting evidence to support the idea that value data such as this can be used as a supplementary selection and placement device. Hopefully other researchers will become involved in the value method of analyzing individual differences so that the true contributions and implications of value information can be discovered.

Table 1

Educational Administrators

Medians and Rankings of Terminal and Instrumental Values (N=62)

Terminal Value	Median	Ranking	Instrumental Value	Median	Ranking
A Comfortable Life	14.64	16	Ambitious	10.93	12
An Exciting Life	8.75	8	Broadminded	7.50	7
A Sense of Accomplishment	2.80	1	Capable	6.17	4
A World at Peace	8.50	6	Cheerful	13.38	15
A World of Beauty	12.67	14	Clean	16.19	17
Equality	9.17	9	Courageous	7.06	5
Family Security	6.00	4	Forgiving	11.83	14
Freedom	5.21	3	Helpful	9.94	11
Happiness	10.83	12	Honest	4.90	2
Inner Harmony	9.50	10	Imaginative	7.10	6
Mature Love	8.50	7	Independent	7.50	8
National Security	15.00	17	Intellectual	6.00	3
Pleasure	14.23	15	Logical	8.25	9
Salvation	17.73	18	Loving	11.17	13
Self-Respect	4.28	2	Obedient	17.04	18
Social Recognition	11.67	13	Polite	14.83	16
True Friendship	10.17	11	Responsible	3.94	1
Wisdom	6.64	5	Self-Controlled	9.90	10

Table 2

Educational Administrators

Frequency Distributions, Medians, and Quartile Deviations

of Terminal and Instrumental Values (N=62)

	Frequencies																			
Terminal Value	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	Median	Quar. Dev
A Comfortable Life	0	2	0	2	2	1	4	0	2	1	2	5	5	3	14	7	9	3	14.64	2.38
An Exciting Life	0	6	4	6	3	4	2	5	4	4	2	1	4	5	5	4	0	3	8.75	4.69
A Sense of Accomplishment	18	10	10	4	4	1	1	4	4	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	2.80	2.32
A World at Peace	9	2	1	4	3	3	3	6	6	3	2	4	5	3	3	3	2	0	8.50	4.11
A World of Beauty	1	1	1	2	3	5	4	3	4	2	2	2	6	8	6	6	3	3	12.67	3.90
Equality	1	3	8	2	3	6	3	3	3	6	1	5	3	2	4	3	3	3	9.17	4.17
Family Security	3	4	3	8	11	4	3	4	6	5	4	2	1	3	0	0	1	0	6.00	2.71
Freedom	6	6	7	7	7	5	5	5	4	3	2	2	1	0	0	1	1	0	5.21	2.60
Happiness	2	4	3	0	2	3	3	4	3	5	6	7	5	5	3	5	2	0	10.83	3.20
Inner Harmony	2	5	2	2	1	10	3	3	3	4	11	3	6	3	2	1	1	0	9.50	2.91
Mature Love	1	0	5	4	7	3	8	3	5	4	5	3	3	3	2	1	3	2	8.50	3.36
National Security	0	1	3	0	0	2	3	1	0	5	3	6	2	2	6	9	14	5	15.00	3.04
Pleasure	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	2	2	4	7	4	11	4	12	9	3	14.23	2.10
Salvation	2	2	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	1	1	1	7	40	17.73	0.77
Self-Respect	8	7	9	9	6	5	5	3	3	4	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	4.28	2.22
Social Recognition	0	1	1	3	3	5	3	4	2	3	5	6	3	7	7	4	5	0	11.67	3.62
True Friendship	0	1	0	2	2	2	5	9	8	3	5	4	8	5	4	3	1	0	10.17	2.65
Wisdom	9	7	4	6	3	1	7	4	3	7	4	2	3	1	0	1	0	0	6.64	3.71

Table 2 (cont.)

	Frequencies																			
Instrumental Value	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	Median	Quar. Dev.
Ambitious	3	1	4	2	5	3	1	7	2	0	7	6	1	3	5	5	3	4	10.93	4.57
Broadminded	3	6	4	5	5	4	4	6	5	6	4	4	4	2	0	0	0	0	7.50	3.13
Capable	8	9	4	2	4	6	4	5	8	3	3	3	2	0	0	0	1	0	6.17	3.36
Cheerful	0	0	0	3	2	1	1	1	4	7	3	2	8	8	6	7	4	5	13.38	2.79
Clean	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	1	1	0	2	1	3	4	7	13	12	15	16.19	1.44
Courageous	2	3	5	6	5	5	9	3	3	4	2	4	2	3	5	0	1	0	7.06	3.42
Forgiving	0	0	2	1	2	4	5	3	3	0	9	6	4	8	6	3	3	3	11.83	3.22
Helpful	3	7	2	0	3	2	2	2	6	9	6	6	6	3	2	1	1	1	9.94	3.25
Honest	14	4	4	5	10	3	6	4	1	3	2	1	2	1	0	1	1	0	4.90	2.88
Imaginative	3	5	1	7	6	6	5	1	5	2	2	5	0	3	4	2	3	2	7.10	3.89
Independent	3	2	7	8	4	6	1	9	3	5	1	3	4	0	1	0	4	1	7.50	3.13
Intellectual	7	6	8	4	4	4	7	5	2	4	1	3	3	2	0	2	0	0	6.00	3.22
Logical	2	4	6	6	2	4	4	4	3	6	4	5	5	3	1	1	2	0	8.25	3.86
Loving	3	2	4	2	1	4	3	0	8	2	3	3	4	6	4	6	5	2	11.17	4.25
Obedient	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	5	1	2	5	9	13	25	17.04	1.16
Polite	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	1	2	2	2	4	11	15	10	7	4	14.83	1.25
Responsible	8	11	8	9	6	5	2	5	2	4	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	3.94	2.11
Self-Controlled	3	2	3	2	1	2	6	6	4	5	9	2	9	3	1	2	2	0	9.90	2.88

REFERENCES

1. Rokeach, M. A Theory of Organization and Change Within Value-Attitude Systems. Journal of Social Issues, 1968, 24, 13-33.

2. Rokeach, M. The Measurement of Values and Value Systems. In G. Abcarian (Ed.) Social Psychology and Political Behavior. Columbus: Charles E. Merrill, 1971.

3. Sikula, A. F. Conflict Via Values and Value Systems. Champaign, Illinois: Stipes Publishing Company, 1971a.

4. Sikula, A. F. Values and Value Systems: Importance and Relationship to Managerial and Organizational Behavior. Journal of Psychology, 1971b, 78, 277-86.

5. Sikula, A. F. Values and Value Systems: Relationship to Personal Goals. Personnel Journal, 1971c, 50, 310-13.

6. Sikula, A. F. Values and Value Systems: And the Relationship to Interpersonal Conflict, Organizational Effectiveness, and Personal Goals. Proceedings: Midwest Division - Academy of Management, East Lansing: Division of Research - Graduate School of Business Administration, 1971d, 318-30.